Remarks

The claims 15, 17, and 22 have been amended to define "**selecting a position of simultaneous arrival for said at least two wipers**", which is supported by the original description at page 8, line 29, to page 9, line 1: "...***it is possible to move at will the position where one wishes the wipers 11 to arrive simultaneously***...". The claimed "**position of simultaneous arrival for said at least wipers**" is referenced by the letter "D" in Figs. 8 and 9 (see also applicant's original disclosure, page 9, lines 1-2). It is believed that these amendments to claims 15, 17, and 22 allow to overcome the Examiner's informal objections to such claims 15, 17, and 22, and that such amendments also allow to overcome the objections to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a), raised at Page 2 of the pending Office action.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's reconsider the particular details of the primary reference **Welch** (US 5,468,026).

In particular, applicant's main claim 1 requires **means for determining the wiping time for each wiper** and **means for measuring the lead time error of the faster wiper with respect to the slower wiper**. Applicant maintains that **Welch** does not disclose these claimed measuring means. The Examiner cites "Fig. 1b, #16 has does all of the functions; col. 5, lines 14-37; cols. 6/7, lines 40-67/1-22" (last phrase of the first paragraph of Page 4 of the pending Office action). Applicant has duly and carefully studied these portions of **Welch** cited by the Examiner but is unable to identify the claimed **means for determining the wiping time for each wiper** and **means for measuring the lead time error of the faster wiper with respect to the slower wiper**.

The explanation of the rejection of Claim 1 at the paragraph bridging Page 3 and Page 4 of the pending Office action dated June 1, 2006 is an identical cut-and-paste of the same paragraph bridging Page 2 and Page 3 of the previous Office action dated January 25, 2006. The only new statement in regard to the **means for determining the wiping time for each wiper** and **means for measuring the lead time error of the faster wiper**

with respect to the slower wiper of Claim 1 to be found in the pending Office action dated June 1, 2006 appears to be found in the first whole paragraph of Page 3: "Welch measure the time of leading wiper and of the lagging wiper, compares the difference...". It is respectfully submitted that these comments do not address applicant's specific arguments submitted April 21, 2006 including the detailed analysis of **Welch**. Column 5, lines 14-17 of **Welch** state "Previously, it was explained that the microcontroller reads the binary values for signals PD and PP to determine the **time delay, if any,** between zones for each motor MD and MP" (emphasis added). It is important to note that here, **Welch** only discloses means that simply detect **if** a time delay ("**if any**") between the zones **is present or not. Welch** does not measure the wiping time for the wipers, nor does **Welch** measure the lead time error of the faster wiper with respect to the slower wiper.

See **signal processing means** of claim 1 of **Welch** at lines 43-52 of column 7:

"***signal processing means for providing the first and second motor drive signals***

for receiving the first and second position signals;

for providing a coast signal if the first blade has reached a first location before the second blade has reached a second location;

for interrupting the first motor drive signal in response to the coast signal;

for providing a dynamic braking signal if the second blade has not reached the first position after a selected elapsed time following the coast signal"

The ***signal processing means for providing a coast signal if the first blade has reached a first location before the second blade has reached a second location*** may be understood from the detailed description of **Welch**:

i. The flow chart of **Fig. 7d** of **Welch** shows "**signal processing sequences for implementing the synchronization steps**" (col. 3. lines 25-27) of the wiper system. Specifically, step S24 "**identifies which blade is the leading blade; that is which blade has entered the new region**

first" (col. 6, lines 60-61). Then step S26 "**sets a timer for a duration of T1, which is the sampling window that determines if the synchronization action needs to be taken**". These two steps are seen at the bottom of **Fig. 7d**. Step S26 then leads to step S30 as seen at the top of the signal processing sequence of **Fig. 7e**.

ii. Step S30 is a test which continuously asks, during the timer duration sampling window, if the lagging blade has entered into its region. See column 6, line 64 to column 7, line 2. Then step 32, as seen in **Fig. 7e**, "**determines if it (the lagging blade) has entered the next region within the time T1**" (column 7, lines 3-4). As seen in **Fig. 7e**, step S32 essentially asks if T1 is exceeded, i.e. if the lagging blade has not entered into its respective region within the sample time T1, set in a timer as above in step S26. If the lagging blade has not entered into its respective region within the sample time T1, the leading blade motor is stopped and the leading blade is allowed to coast at step S34 (column 7, lines 4-8). If instead the lagging blade has entered into its region within the sample time T1, no "coasting" of the leading blade takes place and the process is returned to a "**subsequent processor cycle interval**" (column 7, lines 8-11).

From these specifically cited portions it appears clear that **Welch** does not measure the wiping time for the wipers, nor does **Welch** measure the lead time error of the faster wiper with respect to the slower wiper. **Welch** does not disclose **means for determining the wiping time for each wiper** and **means for measuring the lead time error of the faster wiper with respect to the slower wiper**, as is required by applicant's main claim 1. Applicant respectfully herewith repeats his request that the Examiner specifically point out where in **Welch** these claimed means are disclosed.

Applicant's main claim 1 further requires **means for calculating a correction time that is a function of the lead time error** and **means for applying the correction time to**

the wiper gearmotors so as to reduce the lead time error. Applicant has duly and carefully studied the portions of Welch cited by the Examiner "Fig. 1b, #16 has does all of the functions; col. 5, lines 14-37; cols. 6/7, lines 40-67/1-22", but is unable to identify these claimed **means for calculating a correction time that is a function of the lead time error** and **means for applying the correction time to the wiper gearmotors so as to reduce the lead time error**.

As it was pointed out earlier, the explanation of the rejection of Claim 1 at the paragraph bridging Page 3 and Page 4 of the pending Office action dated June 1, 2006 is an identical cut-and-paste of the same paragraph bridging Page 2 and Page 3 of the previous Office action dated January 25, 2006. The only new statement in regard to the **means for calculating a correction time that is a function of the lead time error** and **means for applying the correction time to the wiper gearmotors so as to reduce the lead time error** of Claim 1 to be found in the pending Office action dated June 1, 2006 appears to be found in the first whole paragraph of Page 3: "Welch...determines if synchronizing action needs to be taken...reduces that error time, determines a duration of coasting, and comes up with a correction time". It is respectfully submitted that these comments do not address applicant's specific arguments submitted April 21, 2006 including the detailed analysis of **Welch**.

Method Claim 19 was rejected as being anticipated by **Welch**, specifically cited by the Examiner at "Fig. 1b, #16 has does all of the functions; col. 5, lines 14-37; cols. 6/7, lines 40-67/1-22" (the same portions as cited for the rejection of the Claim 1). Applicant has duly and carefully studied these portions of **Welch** cited by the Examiner but is unable to identify the combination of method steps as set forth in the Claim 19.

Welch teaches a synchronization system for wiping blades in which:

after a leading blade passes a first position, a control is carried out to check for the passage of a lagging blade at a second position within a set time period;

if the lagging blade reaches its second position before the expiration of the set

time period, nothing is changed and both the leading and lagging blades are continuously powered;

if instead the lagging blade does not reach its second position within the period of set time, the power to the leading blade is cutoff so that the leading blade is allowed to coast, and during a set coasting period of time, a control is still carried out to check for the passage of the lagging blade at its second position within the set coasting time period;

if the lagging blade reaches its second position within the period of set coasting time, the leading blade is re-powered:

if instead the lagging blade does not reach its second position within the set coasting time period, a dynamic braking of the leading blade is carried out; and

when the lagging blade finally reaches its second position, the dynamic braking of the leading blade is turned off and simultaneously the leading blade is re-powered.

If the above-cited summary of the teachings of Welch are deemed incorrect by the Examiner, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner point out and explain where and why the summary is incorrect. Applicant also respectfully requests that the Examiner specifically point out where in **Welch** the combination of method steps as set forth in the method Claim 19 are disclosed.

Specifically, **Welch** does not measure a lead time error of a faster wiper with respect to a slower wiper. **Welch** also does not calculate a correction time that is a function of the lead time error, nor does **Welch** apply such correction time to the wiper gearmotor to reduce the lead time error.

Applicant's undersigned representative may be reached by e-mail at dobyrne@tin.it for discussion of the above points.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel O'Byrne (Reg. No. 36,625)

Agent for the Applicant

Date: August 24, 2006
Address: Via Meravigli 16, 20123 MILAN-ITALY
Telephone: (from USA) (011)(39)(02) 8590-7777
Telefax: (from USA)(011)(39)(02) 863-860